

*Orthopalame Terschellingii* had proved to be identical with *Microprotopus maculatus*, a genus and species described by Norman in the 'Annals and Magazine' for December 1868. The genus *Orthopalame* is therefore cancelled.

M. Jules Bonnier has also, during 1889, discovered and pointed out that in instituting the new genus *Dryope* in 1862, the late Mr. Spence Bate was in error in attributing two branches to the last uropods, and that, in fact, the genus *Dryope*, of which the name was preoccupied, is identical with the genus *Unciola*, Say. The uropods in question are difficult to observe, because, while above they are covered by the minutely scabrous telson, below they are almost concealed by the produced ventral plate of the sixth segment of the pleon. It may be questioned whether the inner branch of the third uropods in this genus is not rather coalesced with the peduncle than absolutely wanting. This is a point which some embryologist might decide.

Of the species which Dr. Julius Vosseler described last year among the Amphipoda of Spitzbergen under the name "*Amphitopsis dubia*, n. sp.," it may be said that there is great reason to regard it as identical with *Amphitopsis glacialis*, Hansen, 1887, although Hansen does not figure or mention the pair of apical setules which Vosseler notices and represents on the telson. Hansen suggests that his species ought possibly to be referred to Boeck's genus *Laothoës*, because the lower antennæ are longer than the upper. In Boeck's genus, however, it is the upper antennæ that are longer than the lower. Further, in *Laothoës* the first maxillæ have a little one-jointed palp, while Vosseler, at least for his "*Amphitopsis dubia*," figures the first maxillæ as having a large two-jointed palp. Boeck himself says that *Laothoës* was preoccupied by Fabricius among Lepidoptera in 1808, and therefore ought to be exchanged for some other name to stand among the Amphipoda. Scudder gives "*Laothoe*, Fabr. Lep. 1808, A;" and if this is correct, there will be no need to alter Boeck's generic name, but figures of *Laothoës Meinerti*, Boeck, are, I believe, still a desideratum.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES.

*The Flora of Suffolk.* By W. M. HIND, LL.D., assisted by the late CHURCHILL BABINGTON, D.D., F.L.S. London: Gurney and Jackson, 1889. Pp. xxxiv, 1-508.

IN 1860 a 'Flora of Suffolk' by the Rev. J. S. Henslow and E. Skepper was published, the former of whom regarded himself as "a consulting but sleeping partner." This, which was issued more as

an inducement to others to add to, than as complete, is now followed up by the present work, which, none the less that the author regards it as not pretending "to be an exhaustive account of the botany of Suffolk," is a great advance in the right direction, and shows that a large amount of information has been gathered together and utilized.

The book contains a Map of the County, introductory chapters treating of the Natural Features, Geology, Climate, Rainfall, and Distribution of Plants; a plan of the Flora, Books, MSS., Herberia, and Authorities; the Flora proper, with a chapter on Palæontological Botany; Tabular View of the Species of Suffolk and adjoining Counties; the flora of East Anglia and Holland compared; the Progress of Botany in Suffolk; Additions, Corrections, and Indexes.

What are the features that make the flora of an East Anglian county specially interesting to the botanist? There are two, the Fens and Broads, and the remarkable district called the "breck-lands." We may dispose of the Broads by saying that they are probably not much altered so far as plant-life goes by drainage and are mostly "growing-up," that is, becoming smaller by the growth of the surrounding vegetation, though they are nothing like botanically examined.

With the Fens the case is very different; in Suffolk a strip along the northern part of the county and perhaps a very small portion between Ely and Lakenheath is all that is in anything like a state of nature, such as Wicken Fen in Cambridgeshire *at present is*.

The flora of the "breck-lands" is perhaps the most local and specialized in Britain; many of the species are quite confined to these sandy heaths and warrens, and not only do the plants point to a former maritime condition, but the birds and insects also, and it seems probable that there are yet other species to be found in early spring.

The historical aspect of a flora is always of much interest; we cannot trace back our records more than three centuries with any certainty. Mr. D. Jackson has disposed of the supposed records by Scribonius Largus in Kent, and shown that they are *mythical*. Dr. Hind says "in some pre-Reformation glass in Gislegham Church the columbine (*Aquilegia vulgaris*) is represented; similar flowers have been recently found in the neighbouring parish of Yaxley by the Rev. W. H. Sewell, who regards the painting as the record of a plant grown on the spot in the fifteenth century or even earlier."

Of course this is, as the author observes, "a somewhat doubtful interpretation of an historical monument."

This is now not capable of proof, and the first record Dr. Hind has for Suffolk is the Sea-Pea (*Lathyrus maritimus*) by Caius (1555), quoted by Martyn in his ed. of Miller's 'The Gardener's and Botanist's Dictionary,' followed by those from Rev. Dr. Bullen (1562), Turner (1568), and Gerarde (1597), &c.

Taking the flora as it is written, the Map shows the county divided into five botanical districts founded on the political divisions for parliamentary purposes. This seems the mistake of an other-

wise admirable book; what possible connexion the two can have it is difficult to see. It may at once be admitted that the county is not one that lends itself to easy division by the river-basins, now so generally adopted. Where even some modification of this has been attempted in conjunction with other natural features (as in a late 'Flora of Finland') the result is better than here given.

Dr. Hind gives the one (and *sole*?) reason in its favour—the ease of finding them on any ordinary map. Three of the districts in the east and the other two in the west nearly fall into the E. and W. Suffolk of Mr. H. C. Watson's Topographical Botany, his division of the county being the meridian of Greenwich, not a good one it must be admitted.

The introductory chapters are very well done, but it is time that under Climate the highest and lowest temperatures if given should be associated with what really affects plant-life, *i. e.* the aggregate amount of heat in summer and cold in winter, accompanied in the latter with some statistics of the snowfall; again, early spring temperatures are a great factor in plant-life, and especially April variations; the writer has known Channel-Island plants to survive 25° of frost in February, but succumb to 8° in April &c.

The author (with his *confrères*) has consulted or had entrusted to him a large number of local herberia, and, what is better, made good use of them. There seem to be very few improbabilities in the Flora proper; but under *Enanthe* some revision is needed. It may very reasonably be suggested that *Æ. pimpinelloides* should be deleted and its localities in part relegated to *Æ. Lachenalii* and some perhaps to *Æ. silaifolia*? *Sisymbrium irio* should surely have been starred as an introduction; this has probably been accidentally omitted to *Sempervivum*. *Melampyrum sylvaticum* can hardly be that species; probably *M. pratense*, var. *hians*, Druce, is really the plant found. The authority for *Galeopsis dubia*, Leers, is not good enough to accept it as a Suffolk plant. Henslow and Skepper's record for *Lithospermum purpureo-cæruleum* is not mentioned; it was, however, hardly likely to have been a native at Bergholt.

The absences from a flora are always of interest; but when the county list and that of the adjoining counties is thrown into the tabular form consulting it becomes wearisome and the eye is apt to be misled. If the tabular form must be given, a list added after, of all the wants of the county, with indications of their distribution around, condensed as in Mr. Watson's works, would be of especial use.

Of the absences *Enanthe crocata* may be noted; this is wanting in Cambridgeshire and a large portion of northern Essex, and, although given as a notable one, is perhaps not so, as on present knowledge it seems absent from Holland, Belgium, and Denmark. *Lathyrus montanus*, Bernh. (*Orobis tuberosus*), is a much more remarkable absentee, though wanting in Norfolk? and Cambridgeshire.

*Potamogeton zosterifolius* and *P. acutifolius* can hardly be really absent, though doubtless they will (if found) be very rare and local.

The chapter comparing the flora with that of Holland induces one to wish that this had been carried further, so little of such work has been attempted in British local floras. Being the work of the late Dr. Babington, Dr. Hind probably did right in so leaving it; none the less it is to be regretted. One plant, however, stated to be absent from Holland *is not so*, i. e. *Peucedanum palustre*, Mœnch., but occurs in many parts abundantly; doubtless the slip has occurred from the Dutch botanists putting it under the genus *Thysselinium*, Hoffm.; had it been absent it would have been a remarkable fact in distribution. *Arenaria leptoclados* and *Galium Vaillantii* are also Dutch species.

The chapter on "The Progress of Botanical Study in Suffolk" contains much interesting matter and satisfactorily concludes the work.

The writer would suggest that if a new edition is at any time undertaken a careful examination should be made of the material at Kew, in Smith's and Winch's herbaria at the Linnean Society, and in the British herbarium at the Natural-History Museum at Kensington; in the first two there certainly is additional matter, and though very time-consuming, the want, if known, may be filled by some one. In these matters we miss that kind and ever-helpful botanist the late Rev. W. W. Newbould.

ARTHUR BENNETT.

*The Fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma.* Published under the Authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council. Edited by W. T. BLANFORD. *Birds.*—Vol. I. By EUGENE W. OATES. London: Taylor and Francis.

In his able Preface the Editor of this series justly congratulates Indian ornithologists upon the acquisition of the services of the author of 'The Birds of Burmah,' a work which, from the excellence of its letterpress, deserves to be bracketed with Col. Legge's 'Birds of Ceylon.' From the scientific point of view the present volume and the two which are to follow will supersede the well-known and classic Jerdon, although many old Indians, who care little for classification, will continue to dwell with pleasure on the badly-printed pages from which they received their earliest lessons in bird-lore. In this they will be justified by the fact that Jerdon's work contains more ample notes on migration, habits, folk-lore, &c. than will be found in Mr. Oates's book, owing to the limits assigned by the authorities to the number and size of the volumes which make up this series. When we consider that the sum total of species enumerated by Jerdon will be exceeded in the present work by more than one half, the necessity for compression by the author will be obvious. The increase is largely due to the extension of the area now comprised in British India, but also to the number of additional species that have been recorded from localities which were little known in Jerdon's time, when such collections as those now in the